



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,319	12/03/2003	Hai Huang	AUS920030761US1	6212

61043 7590 10/10/2006

IBM CORPORATION (MH)  
c/o MITCH HARRIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW, L.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 515  
LAKEMONT, GA 30552-0515

EXAMINER

SUGENT, JAMES F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2116

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/727,319

Applicant(s)

HUANG ET AL.

Examiner

James F. Sugent

Art Unit

2116

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 26 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**LYNNE H. BROWNE**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that nowhere within Faucher (as cited in previous Office Action submitted August 28, 2006) is "an output port coupled to said at least one usage evaluator for reading a state of said at least one usage evaluator, whereby a state of said at least one usage evaluator may be stored external to said device controller." However, Faucher recites the usage evaluator (power management machine 66) does send and store state information external to the device controller in the programmable memory power system (24) (column 10, lines lines 19-29). Therefore, Applicant's arguments are considered but not persuasive.

Applicant further argues that nowhere within Faucher is "an input port coupled to said at least one usage evaluator for setting a state of said at least one usage evaluator, whereby said state of said at least one usage evaluator may be restored from information stored external to said device controller." However, Faucher recites the device controller receiving state information from the memory modules buses 34, 40 and 44 to update the registers (70, 72 and 74) of the power management scoreboard (64) of information from outside the device controller. Said state information within the scoreboard is used by the usage evaluator which necessitates the input port being coupled to the evaluator via the scoreboard (column 6, line 56 thru column 7, line 16 and column 7, lines 38-45 and column 9, lines 17-24 and column 9, lines 56-66 and column 10, lines 23-29 and column 10, lines 36-42). Therefore, Applicant's arguments are considered but not persuasive.

As per the arguments shown above for the input and output ports in claims 1 and 10, they overcome the arguments set forth by the Applicant in reference to the Double Patent rejection arguments. Therefore, the obviousness-type double-patenting rejections for claims 10 and 11 of the instant invention are not overcome by co-pending application 10/727320 claims 8-10 in view of Faucher (as cited above).